

## LADAS & PARRY FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100 Los Angeles, California 90036-5679 Telephone: (323) 934-2300

Facsimile: (323) 934-0202

DELIVER To: Examiner J. Pasterczyk

COMPANY:

U.S. Palent and Trademark Office Group Art Unit: 1755

FAX NUMBER: (703) 305-5433

FROM:

John Palmer, Esq.

DATE:

July 11, 2002

TOTAL No. OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE): 4

SUBJECT:

Gerardo H. Llinas, et al.

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/300,302 "Preparation and Use of Heterogeneous .

Our Ref. No.: 617074-8/JP

Dear Examiner Pasterczyk:

SAPOLD SOUNTED For your convenience, I am enclosing herewith a submission, which was filed via first-class mail with a certificate of mailing dated July 11, 2002. Please consider the submission on the merits before is next Office Action for the above-identified U.S. application

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Yours truly,

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential or privileged information from the law firm of Ladas & Parry. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

> If transmission incomplete, please call (323) 934-2300 and ask for the operator named above.



PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Gerardo H. Llinas,

et al.

RE: SUBMISSION AFTER FINAL PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. & 1.116

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Serial No.: 09/300,302

Filed: April 27, 1999

"PREPARATION AND USE For:

OF HETEROGENEOUS . . . . "

Date: July 11, 2002

Examiner: J. Pasterczyk

Croup Art Unit: 1755

CROUP RECEIVED Our Ref: 617074-8/JP

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Box AF Washington, D.C., 20231

Sir:

On July 11, 2002, we filed a response for the above-identified U.S. application via Express Mail with a certificate of mailing dated July 11, 2002. Unfortunately, a formula was omitted at the top of page 4 in the July 11, 2002 response. Therefore, we are enclosing herewith a revised page 4 for the July 11, 2002 The enclosed revised page 4 includes the previously omitted formula. Please consider the revised page 4 on the merits before issuing next Office Action on the merits.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 12-In particular, if this submission is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this submission as



09/300,302

Page 2

including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 C.F.R § 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this submission timely filed; and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to Deposit Account No. 12-0415.

(Date of Deposit) JOHN PALMER

(Name of Applicant, Assigned or Registered Representative

Respectfully submitted,

John Palmer Reg. No. 36,885

LADAS & PARRY 5670 Wilshire Boulevard

Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300



09/300,302

Page 4

can be found in, inter alia, formula II in originally filed Claim 1 and currently pending Claim 1 when L is a cyclopentadienyl ring, R is a  $C_1$  alkyl group, a is 0, and k is 5.

Amended Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 13-20 are readable upon the elected invention and should be considered on the merits. Amended Claim 9 and currently pending Claim 12 are not readable upon the elected invention, but should be considered on the merits because they are each dependent on an allowable elected claim (amended Claim 8 or amended Claim 11).

In item 2 on pages 2-3 of the outstanding August 10, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner rejects currently pending Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in item 2 because the currently pending claims are not indefinite. Furthermore, this rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn because amended Claims 1-8, 10, 11, and 13-20 are not indefinite.

In item 4 on page 3 of the outstanding August 10, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner rejects currently pending Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13-16, 18, 19 for allegedly being obvious over Vega et al.'s European Patent Document No. EP-0757992 A1 (hereinafter referred to as the "Vega document") for the reasons that are set forth in the second paragraph of item 9 on pages 4-5 of the November 17, 2000 Office Action. In item 5 on page 3 of the